



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,850	06/23/2005	Alistair Zorica	50576-2400	7209
21611 7590 11/12/2008 SNELL & WILMER LLP (OC) 600 ANTON BOULEVARD SUITE 1400 COSTA MESA, CA 92626			EXAMINER MUROMOTO JR, ROBERT H	
			ART UNIT 3765	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/12/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/516,850	Applicant(s) ZORICA, ALISTAIR	
	Examiner BOBBY H. MUROMOTO JR	Art Unit 3765	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-8,10-22,24-27,30 and 31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-8,10-22,24-27,30 and 31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-27, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '319.

'319 discloses a 'combination wetsuit/drysuit for surfing, diving, sailing, marine survival and the like is provided wherein the suit is provided with tight inturned seals at the neck, ankles, and wrists so that it is substantially water tight (abstract).'

'319 clearly discloses a 'fitted garment' that is a 'wetsuit' as claimed.

'319 discloses a first panel (13,15) as seen in figure 1, that has a torso region 'substantially surrounding the waist' and having upper portions 'configured' to 'extend' towards an under arm region, as claimed. Figure 1 clearly shows one panel construction and no seams in the armpit region as claimed.

The first panel clearly has leg portions (13, 15) shown in figure 1.

'319 discloses a second panel 11 that is arranged as in claim 5 and 30.

'319 discloses in figure 1, leg darts, having inner knee seams which 'terminate at an outside calf region', as claimed.

The wetsuit clearly has no underarm gussets as claimed.

Figure 1 clearly shows the torso of the suit made up of less than 5 panels as claimed.

The methods in claims 26 and 27 are clearly disclosed in the citations above.

Although '319 has explicitly disclosed essentially all of the limitations of the instant invention, '319 has not explicitly taught the limitations in instantly cited claims drawn to specific panel location and seaming arrangement (Claims 3, 4, 7-9, 11-14, 25 and 29), and seam length (claims 20-22).

However, '319 has taught, 'the suit is formed with arm portions 7 and 9, fastened to a body portion 11 and leg portions 13 and 15. **The suit can be formed from various pattern pieces as shown. The curved seam 14 is designed in such a matter to make it improbable that a strain will be placed directly on the seam. Also, since all seams are stiff, this curve design allows greater elongation by the fact that when tension is put on a curve seam, there is greater flexibility than if it is a straight seam. The sections are joined by means well known to those skilled in the art such as cementing or sewing or, preferably, a combination of both sewing and cementing.**"

Additionally, garment pattern design variation is a well-known and widely practiced technique, as evidenced by '319 teaching above and numerous garment

patterning references attached in PTO-892. All garment patterns are designed with various panels depending on the various needs of the end use garment.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of garment production to use various garment pattern pieces, that result in various panel and seaming locations for the finished garment to produce a garment that reduces direct strain on the seams.

With respect to the exact seam length, the obvious variation above applies as well as that with respect to changes in size and proportion the MPEP states:

Changes in Size/Proportion

In re Rose, 220 F.2d 459, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955) (Claims directed to a lumber package "of appreciable size and weight requiring handling by a lift truck" where held unpatentable over prior art lumber packages which could be lifted by hand because limitations relating to the size of the package were not sufficient to patentably distinguish over the prior art.); *In re Rinehart*, 531 F.2d 1048, 189 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1976) ("mere scaling up of a prior art process capable of being scaled up, if such were the case, would not establish patentability in a claim to an old process so scaled." 531 F.2d at 1053, 189 USPQ at 148.).

In *Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984), the Federal Circuit held that, where the only difference between the prior art and the claims was a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device was not patentably distinct from the prior art device.

Since the only difference between the prior art and the claimed device is the recitation of relative dimension of the seam length total, and the prior art device clearly teaches seam and pattern design to decrease stress on the seam like the claimed

invention, the claimed invention is not patentably distinct and therefore would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/15/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant has amended claim 1 to incorporate cancelled claims 3 and 9 that were clearly addressed in previous and current rejections.

Applicant's argues that the reference teaches away from reducing seam length. This argument is incorrect. Nothing in the reference speaks to the inoperability of using shorter seams. O'Neill clearly teaches variation in seam shapes which would inherently call for varied seam length.

Applicant argues no teachings in the reference teach single panel construction, however with regards to such modifications the MPEP cites, "*In re Larson*, 340 F.2d 965, 968, 144 USPQ 347, 349 (CCPA 1965) (A claim to a fluid transporting vehicle was rejected as obvious over a prior art reference which differed from the prior art in claiming a brake drum integral with a clamping means, whereas the brake disc and clamp of the prior art comprise several parts rigidly secured together as a single unit. The court affirmed the rejection holding, among other reasons, "**that the use of a one piece construction instead of the structure disclosed in [the prior art] would be merely a matter of obvious engineering choice.**"

Applicant has incorrectly attributed darts to one piece of material. Darts are known as tapered seams, they are not limited to only one piece of material.

All other arguments are drawn to the claim limitations that are a result of variation in garment design that has been clearly addressed above.

Since these are the arguments the rejections remain and are considered to be proper.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BOBBY H. MUROMOTO JR whose telephone number is (571)272-4991. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-530, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Welch can be reached on 571-272-4996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3765

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robert H Muromoto, Jr./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3765